3. Simutis S-4 (no date) 1942 RB 5 Lithuanians RB

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

000 Lithuania as a nation has a great past. Although it has been definitely established that the country was in existence before the twelfth century, there is a long shadowy period preceding her recorded history.

HISTORIC BACKGROUND

●197 The Lithuanian people form a distinct race and they speak their own language, which is wholly different from the languages of the neighboring countries of Russia, Poland, and Germany. Philologists find the Lithuanian language very helpful for comparative language studies and research, and some of them have found Lithuanian to be very close to the Sanskrit.

101 The first to mention and describe the people on the Baltic shores was the Roman writer, Tacitus, who at the end of the first century, in his treatise *Germania*, calls them *aestii, aestiorum gentes*.[1]

The Aestii, like most European peoples (Germanic, Slavic, Celtic, Italian, Hellenic), belong to the Indo-European family of nations, although whence the Aestii came to the Baltic shores is still a problem to historians. Philologists find three groups of Aestii: Prussians (Lithuanian *Prusai;* German

[1] A. Sapoka, *Lietuvos Istorija* (History of Lithuania), Svietimo Ministerijos K.L.K. Leidinys, Kaunas, p. 18.

113

Altlitauischen," Tauta ir Žodis (People and Word), Vol. VII (Kaunas, 1931).

K. Alminauskas, Die Germanismen des Litauischen, I, Kaunas, no date.

A. The Place of Lithuanian in the Framework of the Indo-European Languages

000 Every language is an image of the thinking and feelings of a people. It gives an elaborate and colorful picture of the inner nature of the people in the most sensitive shadings, not only through what it says but also through what it does not say. For words and concepts with all their nuances, indeed even grammatical constructions--if they are for once not observed with the eyes of the philologist--are only symbols for all the elements of which the spiritual and intellectual life of a people consists and through which it is distinguished from others.

• 197 The Lithuanian language belongs to the Balto-Slavic branch of the Indo-European languages. With the languages of the Letts, Cours, Zemgalens, Selens and Old Prussians, it is included in a special "Baltic" group. Nevertheless there are differences to be noted here. The Lettish language is related to Lithuanian as a younger sister language. It has been more mixed with foreign elements because of its closer contact with German and has lost many ancient features which Lithuanian has faithfully preserved. Old Prussian, on the other hand, even more ancient in grammatical structure, seemed at first /12/ to stand considerably closer to Lithuanian, as far as could be determined from the few preserved records. Nevertheless as early in 1876 Kurschat found that from a linguistic point of view the relation of Old Prussian to Lithuanian was not really as close as that of Lettish to Lithuanian. He assembles a number of words of comparison of Old Prussian with Lithuanian, and remarks: "What may have been borrowed by one of these languages

197 from the other, by Old Prussian from Lithuanian or vice versa, must remain completely undetermined." (1)

1. A comparison of Old Prussian with Lithuanian is made more difficult by the fact that in the Old Prussian language little more than three translations of the Luther catechism (two from the year 1545 and one from the year 1561) have been preserved. At that time, however, as Kurschat observes, Old Prussian was already a language that was dying out, and apparently the translators were not enough in command of the language "to be able to reproduce
[113] it with reliable exactness." (Friedrich Kurschat, Grammatik der littauischen Sprache, Halle, 1876, pp. 56-57.)

With the close relationship of the Lithuanian, Lettish, and Old Prussian languages the common features in their vocabularies are naturally not surprising:

	Lithuanian	Lettish	Prussian
"god"	dievas	dievs	deivs
"hand"	ranka	ruoka	ranko
"head"	galve	galva	galvo
"iron"	gel(e)žis	dzelzs	gelso
"steel"	plienas	pliens	plainis

Nevertheless, in spite of such similarities the fundamental differences between these languages should not be forgotten, as they strike us for example in the word bread: Lithuanian duona, Lettish maize, and Prussian geitis. Very frequently, too, we find the case that Old Prussian contrasts markedly in its vocabulary with Lithuanian and Lettish:

•197

	Lithuanian	Lettish	Prussian
"butter"	sviestas	sviests	anktan
"milk"	pienas	piens	dadan

Modern linguistics therefore assumes that the primitive Baltic language split into two branches sometime between the fifth and third centuries B.C. -- a western /13/ (Prussian) and an eastern, to which would be assigned the languages of the Lithuanians, Letts, Cours, Zemgalens, and Selens. From the eastern branch resulted later -- presumably in the eleventh and twelfth centuries -- the languages of the individual peoples. (2)

[113]

2. Trautmann, Altpreussische Sprachdenkmäler, pp. VIII-XV.

The question of what place Lithuanian holds within the Indo-European languages stimulated research very early. As early as 1856, in the introduction to his Handbuch der litauischen Sprache, Schleicher gives us a clear definition when he observes -- in general not incorrectly: "The Lithuanian language belongs to the great Indo-European speech family. Indic and Persian, Greek and Latin, Slavic, Lithuanian, and German, and finally the language called Celtic are the branches of this family, and each branch is again divided more or less into languages or dialects ... Slavic and Lithuanian, however, resemble each other so much in many parts of their grammar and vocabulary that one could be inclined to consider them members of one and the same language group if great differences in other parts of the language structure did not keep one from such a view. Of all the living Indo-European languages, Lithuanian shows in its sound by far the greatest antiquity; hence its great importance for linguistics." (3)

•197
[113]

3. A. Schleicher, Handbuch der litauischen Sprache (Prague, 1856-57), Vol. I, Litauische Grammatik, Introduction.

Since Schleicher wrote these words a period of almost 80 years has elapsed during which the Lithuanian language has been investigated by a great number of researchers, mostly Germans. The place of Lithuanian within the Indo-European language group is today unequivocally established: with the remaining Baltic and Slavic languages, as well as with Indic, Iranian, Armenian, and Albanian, it forms the so-called satem group of Indo-European, while the Germanic languages, together with Greek, Latin, and Celtic, belong to the centum group. "The difference exists in the fact that certain palatal sounds of the original language /14/ became sibilants in the satem languages but remained for the time unchanged or perhaps became harder in the centum languages." (4)

[113]

4. A. Senn, Kleine litauische Sprachlehre (Heidelberg, 1929), p. 2.

The connection of the Baltic and Slavic branches of the Indo-European languages has also been shown in detail by a whole series of older investigators, Brugmann, Leskien, Fortunatov, Porzezinski, Meillet, and others. In 1923, Trautmann published an etymological dictionary of the Balto-Slavic languages. (5)

[113]

5. Trautmann, Baltisch-slawisches Wörterbuch (Göttingen, 1923). Cf. also E. Fraenkel, "Zur baltoslawischen Etymologie und Wortforschung," Tauta ir Zodis, Vol. III (Kaunas, 1925), pp. 481-89.

Although Indo-European linguistics assigns

•197 the Baltic languages (including Lithuanian) together with the Slavic, to a broader group, it must nevertheless be specifically stressed in this connection that Lithuanian is not a Slavic language. Whereas all Slavic peoples (Russians, Poles, Czechs, etc.) can at least make themselves understood among each other, a linguistic understanding between Slavs and Lithuanians is impossible. Concerning this, many errors are still prevalent.
192 They have mainly resulted from the fact that Lith-
197 uanian was earlier overlaid with Slavic words, for which, however, there were at the same time original words in Lithuanian. I am thinking here for example of words such as were still cited by Kurschat as "Lithuanian": (6)

6. Fr. Kurschat, see above, p. 53. 1/K

	Pure Lithuanian	
"week"	nedele	savaitē
"bell"	zvanas	varpas
"miracle"	dyvas	stebuklas
"world"	svietas	pasaulis
"consumption"	sukata	džiova
"hour"	adyna	valanda
"punish"	koroti	bausti
"sinful"	griešnas	nuodemingas, et

Although some of the pure Lithuanian words named here may be new linguistic formations (e.g. savaitē), one should not forget that these new formations in any case /15/ go back to Baltic stems. In addition there is a series of Slavic words in Lithuanian for which no genuinely Lithuanian words can be found, principally in the area of religious life as well as in the areas with which the Lithuanians became familiar through the Slavs. (7) A third group of words that are fre-

1/K [see cat. 116, p 9 --Analyst]

192 •197 [113]

1 ^7. K. Buga, "Die litauisch-weissrussischen Beziehungen und ihr Alter," special number of the Zeitschrift für slawische Philologie (Leipzig, 1924), Vol. I, Nos. 1/2, pp. 26-55. Būga points out that a series of White Russian words of religious content must have found its way into the Lithuanian language even before 1387 (pp. 50 and 52). The same would apply to the terms for a number of objects with which the Lithuanians became acquainted through the trade with the White Russians even before 1200; e.g. glass, silk, market, donkey, radish, and others (p. 46).

quently looked upon as Slavic is of proto-Indo-European origin and thus equally at home in both languages. Finally, Lithuanian contains many words that passed over into the Slavic languages. A comparison of the Lithuanian language with the Slavic languages presents thus a great number of factors that have to be taken into consideration.

197 All in all we can say today that the relationship of these languages on closer observation does not prove to be as close as it appeared to [194] Schleicher. Above all, there is a strikingly small number of sibilants in Lithuanian, while the sibilants actually impose a special stamp on Slavic. [193] On the other hand, Slavic feeling for language is reflected to a large extent in the syntax and grammar of Lithuanian. Thus the Lithuanian language, exactly as Polish, puts the predicate substantive in the instrumental and puts the object in the genitive with negative verbs. Certain sibilants, e.g. the č in mačiau "I saw," are traceable for the first time around the turn of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but do not represent a borrowing from Slavic. It is interesting that the educated Russian and Pole will not admit any close relationship of Lithuanian with his own language and that, quite the contrary, he is inclined to look at the Lithuanian language as something com-

1 [footnote to text on page 12, see cat. 192 or 197--Analyst] purely foreign.

000pletely foreign.

162 Lithuanian is spoken today by about three
191 million people, half of whom understand only their native language. Since a detailed description of the Lithuanian language area would extend considerably beyond the limits of this presentation, only the following may be said briefly on the subject: Lithuanian is the native language of the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of the Lithuanian state. Beyond this /16/ a large section of the Lithuanian language area is found today under Polish rule (the Vilna area). Furthermore, the area of the Lithuanian language projects on the one hand into Latvia and on the other into East
[167] Prussia. Finally, there are in the United States large, close-knit Lithuanian communities which may include a total of about half a million people. In Chicago alone 70,000 Lithuanians have been counted. These people are emigrants and their descendants. Large Lithuanian colonies have also arisen in South America, especially in recent times.

•197 In spite of its relatively small size we
184 find within the enclosure of the Lithuanian language area a large number of dialectal differences. The principal dialects are High Lithuanian and Low Lithuanian (Samogitian), of which the latter is related to the former in about the same way as Low German is to High German. In addition to its vocabulary, Samogitian is distinguished from High Lithuanian by its accentuation, its drawled pronunciation, and its loss of fully pronounced endings. It is divided in turn into the dialects of Raseiniai and Telšiai, which are distinguished from each other principally by transposition of the vowels of the diphthongs. In the writings of the poetess Žemaitė, Low Lithuanian stands out sharply in syntax and vocabulary.

The High Lithuanian dialect group is divided into an eastern and a western subgroup. Western High Lithuanian in turn consists of two dialects, whose border is formed approximately by

197 184 the Memel. In the eastern group of High Lithuanian a series of dialects can also be distinguished. Dzūkijan, or Southeast Lithuanian, as well as North Lithuanian spoken in the river area of the Mūšā (north of Panevėžys) stand out as particular dialects. (8)

8. A. Senn, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

The large number of dialectal differences implies for the vocabulary and form of the language an enrichment not to be underestimated. This surprising richness in a relatively small territory /Unnumbered page with illustration--Lithuanian Landscape/ /17/ can probably be attributed primarily to the seclusion of the individual districts. This resulted from a backwardness of many centuries and a conservative adherence to inherited land. The differences of the dialects, however, are not so strong that they could destroy the unity of the language. The present literary language is based on the dialect of the South Lithuanian province of Užnemunė (earlier the gouvernement Suvalkija), which is spoken particularly on the south bank of the Memel, in other words, the southern dialect of western High Lithuanian. We thus find in standard Lithuanian the long vowels of the final syllables preserved. (9)

[113]

9. All grammatical presentations of the present Lithuanian standard language are based primarily on the work of Prof. Jablonski, who, under the name Rygiškių Jonas, is the author of: Lietuvių kalbos vadovelis (Kaunas, 1925); and Lietuvių kalbos gramatika, 2nd ed. (Kaunas-Vilna, 1922).

197 192 B. Antiquity and Formal Richness of the Lithuanian Language

In the year 1625 the Königsberg clergyman Johannes Rhesa wrote in the preface to his Lith-

192
197 uanian Psalter: "If we observe many strange words in the Lithuanian language, it will be found that it is a mixed language, stemming from other major languages, especially Greek and Latin, a fact which becomes evident for example in the proverb [53] of the Lithuanians: Dewas dawe dantes, Dewas dos ir dones; that is, 'If God has given teeth, he must also have given bread.' Whoever knows Greek or Latin will find that most of the words take their origin from these languages." (10)

10. Quoted on the basis of Bezzenberger, see footnote 13[1]

197 We have seen[2] that Indo-European linguistic research in its further development has not confirmed this view of the old Königsberg clergyman, although it still haunted the German press during the First World War. (11) /18/ Rather, linguistic

[113] 11. Prof. Dr. Leo Brenner, "Litauer und Preussen, Stammesbrüder der Griechen," Deutsche Tageszeitung, September 12, 1917.

research has shown us that Lithuanian, together with Greek and Latin, originated in a common primitive language--Indo-European, and that the similarities of these languages are due to this fact. That these similarities are so striking, however, finds its explanation in the unusual antiquity of the Lithuanian language, which in this regard occupies a unique position among all the Indo-European languages. Schleicher already finds it remarkable that so ancient a language still exists at all. He refers to the dual and the seven Indo-European cases in Lithuanian that at times match the Sanskrit. He stresses that Lithuanian remained almost completely free of the great sound changes which the rest of the Indo-European languages underwent, and assigns to Lithuanian a similar role in the framework of the

1 [see cat. 116, pp. 17-18 -- Analyst]
2 [see cat 116, pp. 8-13 -- Analyst]

•197 most closely related Slavic languages as is played by Gothic in a comparative presentation of the Germanic languages. Schleicher explains the antiquity of Lithuanian by the seclusion of the Lithuanian country folk from historical movements, and draws a parallel with Icelandic. (12) One of the

[113]

12. Schleicher, Vergleichende Sprachgeschichte (1848) (cf. here the chapter on the "Zetazismus der litauischen Sprache"); and Die Sprachen Europas (1850).

best modern experts on the Lithuanian language, Prof. Bezzenberger, expresses himself similarly: "If one asks, however, whence it comes that Lithuanian has preserved until today such splendid features of antiquity. . .while all other Indo-European languages have in contrast long gone about [181] in an unusually strong conservative trait in the Lithuanians." (13) Although for the ~~[illegible]~~

197
174

13. Bezzenberger's reply to L. Brenner's essay, "Litauer und Preussen," Königsberger Hartungsche Zeitung, February 10, 1918. Cf. on this point in the same newspaper, on October 24, 1918, the reply of Dr. Herbert Krüger, "Griechen und Litauer": "Whether the division of the Indo-European languages into centum and satem languages, based on phonetic differences, also forms a good standard for the degree of relationship of the peoples concerned will be contested from many sides. It must be left to the work of specialists to decide whether only the general Indo-European relationship exists between the Lithuanians and the Greeks, or a somewhat closer relationship, which Herr Geheimrat Bezzenberger disputes. Before the assumed division there must have existed at one time a unified original people, and if, as even Herr Geheimrat Bezzenberger does, we no longer

197 174 place the original home of this primitive people in far-off Asia, but in Europe on the shore of the Baltic Sea, the ancestors of the Greeks must have emigrated to the south from their northern homeland, separating themselves from the original people either before or after the Lithuanians."

197 193 Although for the linguist it is naturally just as essential to determine in what ways Lithuanian differs from the old languages of the Latins and Greeks, it is still not without fascination to examine the great antiquity of the Lithuanian language on the basis of the existing similarities. For the declension cases of Latin and Lithuanian the example "man" (Latin vir, Lithuanian vyras) may be given:

/19/

	Singular		Plural	
	Latin	Lithuanian	Latin	Lithuanian
Nom.	vir	vyras	viri	vyrai
Gen.	viri	vyro	virorum	vyrų
Dat.	viro	vyrui	viris	vyrams
Acc.	virum	vyrą	viros	vyrus
Voc.	vir	vyre	viri	vyrai

While Latin knows for vir only an ablative with an instrumental and locative function (viro--viris), Lithuanian has at its disposal both a locative (vyre--vyruose) and an instrumental (vyru--vyrais). In addition to these cases there are in Lithuanian three more that are formed by attaching suffixes: girion "toward the forest" (giria "forest") dievopi "to God" (dievas "God"), and dieviep "with God."

197 192 Word similarities are especially striking:

"god"	deus	dievas
"tooth"	dens	dantis

197
192

"ear"	auris	ausis
"fire"	ignis	ugnis
"yoke"	iugum	jungas
"sheep"	ovis	avis
"sun"	sol	saulē

The Latin sentence viri trahite iugum is translated into modern Lithuanian vyrai traukite junga.

197 In inflection there are striking similarities with Greek and Sanskrit:

193

	Greek	Sanskrit	Lithuanian
"I am"	εἰμί<ἐσμι	asmi	esu and esmi
"you are"	ἐσί	asi	esi
"he is"	ἐστί	asti	yra and esti

These few examples of the antiquity of Lithuanian vocabulary and morphology may suffice. A /20/ further very old element is the dual, which is still alive today in its rich forms, primarily in the Lithuanian dialects. Thus, from the circle of languages that are today silent, Lithuanian projects into our living present like a monument of ancient times. The sentence structure is ancient. Subject and predicate usually stand next to each other with no connecting element. Only rarely is the relation of the sentences to each other in pure Lithuanian style expressed by connecting words, rather it must be recognized from the meaning. Thus the sentences are strung together as in the old fairy tales or as in the Greek language before the artificial period structure was introduced. Many sentence sequences might be compared with old woodcuts. Particularly difficult, especially for Germans, is the Lithuanian case system, in which, next to the genitive, the instrumental plays a large role. The German subjunctive is often represented in Lithuanian by participial constructions. The latter are frequently used as absolute constructions (the ablative absolute of Latin and the genitive absolute of

●197 Greek). Thus, for example, Lithuanian has a con-
193 struction that must be described precisely as a dative absolute.

192 Among the ancient features of Lithuanian can be listed also the diminutive forms, which are probably not used in such abundance in any other living language. They surround the language like a colorful scroll and are especially essential to the folk songs. But while, for example, High German knows today only two such diminutives, -chen and -lein, Lithuanian has at its disposal an incomparably large number, which are attached not only to substantives but also to adjectives and even verbs and adverbs. If we take for example the word "small" mažas, we find the following forms: mažalēlis, mažilēlis, maželēlis, mažutis, mažytis, mažiukas, mažulēlis, mažiulukas, mažulytis, mažutēlis, mažiulis, mažylis, mažučiukas. W. Kalwaitis counts in his Litauischer Namensschatz no less that 66 diminutive forms for the word mama "mother," among them even a fivefold diminutive /21/ mamaitužužužēlē. (14) We have an excellent

[113] 14. W. Kalwaitis, Litauischer Namensschatz (Lithuanian and German) (Tilsit, 1910), p. 24, where the following progression of diminutives from mama are given: mamaitē--mamaitužē--mamaitužužē--mamaitužužužē--mamaitužužužēlē. It might be possible that a conscientious philologist who counted all the diminutive forms of this one word might arrive at the figure 100.

article by Prof. Brender on the significance of the diminutive forms in Lithuanian. (15) Brender shows

[113] 15. F. Brender, "Die Verwendung der sogenannten Diminutive im Litauischen," Tauta ir Žodis (Kaunas, 1925), Vol. III, pp. 76-111.

here that diminution occurs primarily with such

197 Present-day linguistics points out that in
194 the Lithuanian language the intonation of the primitive Indo-European language has still been preserved. This can be seen with particular clarity in a comparison with Greek: e.g. Lithuanian algà (from algā̃); Greek ἀλφή "profit"; but genitive algõs, Greek ἀλφῆς .

Let it be said that here, too, there are variations in Lithuanian, in that some dialects have obliterated the length distinctions and have thus become simpler with regard to rhythm and melody (e.g. Samogitian). Where, however, the old rhythm has remained fully preserved, it has kept the endings from wearing away and degenerating, as we find them for example in /23/ Lettish, where the words are always stressed on the first syllable. Certainly the melody of the Lithuanian language, which many linguists have noticed, rests in large part upon this peculiar swaying rhythm.

194 The beauty and melody of the Lithuanian language unfolds its full euphony particularly in song. It has been appreciated by many scholars and artists. Thus by Élisée Reclus: "If the value of a nation in the whole of humanity could be measured by the beauty of its language, the Samogitians and Lithuanians would be in the first rank among the inhabitants of Europe." (18)

[113]

18. Élisée Reclus, Nouvelle Geographie Universelle, Vol. V, (Paris, 1880), p. 431.

We have found one reason for the phonetic beauty of this language in the minor role of the sibilants, in which it is distinguished from the Slavic languages, a second reason in the musical rhythm peculiar to it which gives it a swaying movement. Finally, a third reason is its richness in pure vowels. They are primarily the vowels a, o, and u, while compressed vowels like the Russian ы are not present at all. We are indebted to Vydūnas for interesting statistics on

195 of Slavic elements. (20)

[113] 20. The oldest language monuments of Lithuanian from the year 1547 on have been published in Gerullis: Moswid, Die ältesten litauischen Sprachdenkmäler bis zum Jahre 1570, edited by Dr. Georg Gerullis, Indogermanische Bibliothek, Vol. II (Heidelberg, 1923).

195 197 After the middle of the last century Lithuanian literature awoke to a life of its own, and from that time on there developed a Lithuanian language which takes its expressive and formal content from the various Lithuanian dialects without, however, arriving immediately at exact and clear conceptual definitions. Difficulties resulted from the fact that a number of expressions of the language had taken on meanings colored by dialect, and partially even contrasting meanings, in the separate provinces. The first task consisted therefore in a unification and conceptual delimitation of the available vocabulary. This process has even today not yet fully been carried out, although it is essentially complete. Some of the differences between the former and present literary language is explained by this fact. From decade to decade Lithuanian literary language has been gaining expressiveness, force, and richness. But still it was in its nature a peasant language that had not caught up with the rapid Western development in science and technology.

/25/ A powerful impetus was given by the founding of the independent Lithuanian state. Three problems resulted for the further development of the literary language. The first problem consisted in freeing the language from the Slavic influences by which it was at times completely ruled -- this applies to whole provinces -- and to replace the formerly employed Slavic words with pure Lithuanian

195
197 ones. This problem was capable of complete solution, since in the large vocabulary of Lithuanian everyday speech the necessary words or stems were available and only education of the people and enlightenment through the schools were needed. Moreover, the newly awakened national consciousness pushed the development forward. In addition, among the existing dialects of the Lithuanian language, which still stood side by side as equals and which are clearly reflected in their great variety in the earlier writings of the Lithuanian poets, there was the question of choosing one dialect -- as mentioned, the Suvalkijan dialect was picked -- and constructing on it the new literary language that would be valid for the whole land. This task ran into greater difficulties. Moreover there was danger that now, with the necessity of gradation, the rest of the dialects would be discredited and the language would thus lose much richness. For in every people the so-called literary language gains constantly new strength from its contact with the dialects.

814
195 The enormous task of uniformly constructing and elaborating the new literary language was undertaken by the distinguished Lithuanian linguist Jablonskis, or as he called himself, Rygiškių Jonas. Born on January 12, 1861 on a farm east of the Šešupė, he attended the Russian gymnasium in Marijampolė, studied ancient languages in Moscow, and later taught at universities in various cities. After the founding of the Lithuanian University he was named Professor of the Lithuanian language. Jablonskis possessed on the one hand an excellent /26/ training in ancient languages and on the other hand stood in close touch with the simple country folk. He thus succeeded in comprehending the individuality of the Lithuanian language and in recognizing the foreign influences. The abundance of Lithuanian idioms that are distributed throughout his works is very great and shows us the full power and expressive possibilities of this

814 language. To be sure, Jablonskis was primarily a
195 grammarian and not an artist. Most important to him was simple clarity. But he always appreciated and welcomed also poets and thinkers taking part in the creation of the language, and never held back with his advice. (21)

[113]

21. A brief appreciation of Jablonskis in German is given by Vydūnas: "Schöpfer der litauischen Schriftsprache," Unsere Stimme (Tilsit), Vol. 2, pp. 27-28.

195 The third problem† that had to be overcome
197 in the creation of the Lithuanian literary language, and that was perhaps the most important of all, was a question of transforming the Lithuanian language from a peasant language into an instrument with which even the educated, the artist, and the scientist would be able to work. In this connection it was first of all a matter of elaborating the vocabulary. This, then, will be considered first.

192 If we will look at the vocabulary of the Lithuanian language, we must first of all refute the widespread notion that the language is poor in words. A peasant language may appear poor in words to a representative of Western city culture; but it never has been, absolutely speaking. In its living organism there is an enormous ramification. This is true for the Lithuanian language as for every other peasant language. The countless skills of the peasant's work, the diverse nuances of the peasant's life itself, of which the typical city person no longer has any knowledge, all bear special terms. In addition there is a second group of words and word formations that stem from the antiquity of the Lithuanian language and find no parallel in modern Western languages. Every language develops just as much from complexity to simplicity as from /27/ simplicity to complexity. We describe the former as typification and general-

† [cat. 116, pp. 25-27 -- Analyst]

192 From the area of the mind, too, examples could be added. Let those mentioned here be enough to refute the story of the general paucity of words in Lithuanian. Further, the psychological difference between the Lithuanian and German languages is sufficiently indicated by what is said here. As early as the year 1800 it occurred to Mielcke in the preparation of his German-Lithuanian dictionary /29/ that "the concepts in the two languages are not constructed from the same characteristics and do not cover the same ground, and moreover if a Lithuanian word expresses the meaning of a German word, the connotations of each of these words are often at the same time extremely different." (23)

[113] 23. Christian Gottlieb Mielcke, Littauisch-deutsches und Deutsch-littauisches Wörterbuch (Königsberg, 1800), Preface, p. 4.

197 195 We thus see that the Lithuanian language, as a result of the working together of the most varied factors, represents a finely organized and rich organism. But this richness lies, apart from the formal elements, in the main in the area of things perceived through the senses, of the objective. For the further development of the Lithuanian literary language the most important problem thus turned out to be its elaboration for the areas of the spiritual and intellectual, i.e. of art, science, technology, etc. This problem was insoluble as long as the Lithuanian people as a clearly defined and spiritually homobeneous mass had been cut off from the Western European development by the barrier of the Russian boundary and Russian oppression. One cannot construct a world of concepts in new words where the knowledge and understanding of the concepts themselves do not yet exist among the masses. First of all a broader educated class must be created to be the bearer of this new world of words and concepts, from which the newly gained knowledge

• 197
195

can flow in a thousand channels over the whole land. Thus the problem of the creation of the Lithuanian language was subordinate to a much greater problem: it was a question of the destiny of the Lithuanian people, who had remained many decades behind the rapid Western European development, to win a place in Western intellectual life. This, however, was in turn possible only through language; not through a small circle of educated individuals obtaining this place by recourse to one world language or another, but through the whole people obtaining in its language a medium of expression and understanding by means of which it was in a position /30/ to take part in the further cultural development of the world. Both problems are conditional on each other and are only mutually soluble. The further development of the Lithuanian literary language involves, therefore, a problem just as much sociological as linguistic, unless one wanted to create an artificial language for a small circle, the secrets of which would have to remain incomprehensible to the broad masses. But no one thinks of such a thing in Lithuania.

Enormous was the task and tireless the labor that was expended. The problem was not to be solved by one linguist or even by linguistics as such. The development had rather to result through practical life. Who can imagine today the difficulties involved in animating with words a language that, in spite of all its internal richness and beauty, lacked the terms for the necessary articles in a modern office as well as for the furnishing of a city apartment? The rapid economic advance in Lithuania also pushed the linguistic development pitilessly forward, created words and terms and destroyed them again, until gradually that which had been proved remained, became established, and was carried over into the general vocabulary, above all through the press,

• 197
195

which had to be linguistically creative to a high degree.

Thus the development of the Lithuanian literary language, if only in the speed with which it was effected, -- something similar applies, mutatis mutandis, to Lettish and Esthonian-- implies actually a revolution that represents something unheard of and unique in the history of languages. A complete terminology had to be created in all conceivable areas of knowledge; it was necessary to increase the expressive potentials for science, technology, and art to an unheard-of extent, to define concepts scientifically, to create nuances, in short to make up in a few years for what among other peoples had come about in organic growth over the course of centuries. The uniqueness of this development and of what has already been achieved has, /31/ it seems to me, not yet fully been grasped by the Lithuanian people, even in its educated classes. And yet this development of the language, together with the revelation of an unexpectedly strong popular will for life, implied a great intellectual advance, the only basis, as we have seen, on which it could be accomplished at all.

If we ask what has been accomplished today, after two decades, we see a large section of the charted course already travelled. The literary language as such has been stabilized like every other language and is spread across the whole country in a unified form through general instruction in the schools. The Slavic admixtures have largely been dropped off and hardly appear any more in the speech of the younger generation. Adaptation to the Western European world languages has made great progress; a scientific language is being formed. The leader in this area was the Lithuanian University. Naturally, this latter development, according to its nature, has not yet been concluded.

It is only natural that the further develop-

195
197

ment of the language in the various areas of intellectual life did not proceed everywhere with the same speed. It was primarily political, educational, and also economic problems which provided the material for the formation of the new literary language since the beginning of the 1880's, and it was in turn the same problems which, together with the objects of external civilization, necessarily became the prominent topics of literary discussion after the founding of the state, while the artistic and poetic element had to play a minor part in the consciousness of the people. Thereby the Lithuanian literary language remained essentially direct, natural, clear and concrete. The transfer of the objective to the spiritual, however, a practise so predominant today in the languages of the West and developed in the subtlest forms by whole generations of poets, has only recently become applicable in Lithuanian for the first time within narrow limits. Everything is still seen concretely; a spiritual feeling for metaphor has not yet been /32/ experienced. Thus in Lithuanian everyday speech one cannot say, to take a few everyday examples from the German language: die wandernden Jahre [the wandering years] (only a person can wander), ein sonniger Mensch [a sunny person] (a room is sunny), klingendes Spiel [sounding play], die versunkene Erinnerung [sunken memory] (a stone sinks in the water), reine Augen [pure eyes] (only an object is pure), in bescheidenen Grenzen, [within modest limits], etc. This spiritual feeling for metaphor, which today has already been transferred in part from the language of the Western poets into the everyday speech of their peoples, cannot now be awakened artificially but presupposes also a psychological transformation. Even in the German language it did not exist in an earlier period. In Lithuanian metaphor has existed from olden times

195 where it is a matter of the personification of
• 197 things. The best proof are the Lithuanian folk riddles: the river runs, the shoes gape, the grain comes home to sleep, etc. In modern Lithuanian poetry we find, on the other hand, the transition to the abstract throughout. Thus, for example, in Balys Sruoga (Saulė ir smiltys):

Go onto the long
Road of autumn. . .(p. 111)

or

. . .the stars which inflamed the
heavens
With the fire of life --
I do not envy. (p. 62)

In modern poetry--in this connection I refer to the poetic imitations in the last chapter -- the spiritualization of the objective is thus shown in living images. It is to be expected that everyday language, too, will not escape this influence, once recent Lithuanian poetry has penetrated deeper into the people. The more slowly and organically this spiritual transformation process takes place, the richer will be the fruits to be expected from it.(24)

113 24. The most important scientific literature concerning the Lithuanian language of the nineteenth century is listed by Oscar Wiedemann, Handbuch der Litauischen Sprache (Strassburg, 1897), pp. 4-6. In particular may be mentioned: Leopold Geitler, Litauische Studien (Prague, 1875). Adalbert Bezzenberger, Beiträge zur Geschichte der litauischen Sprache. Auf Grund litauischer Texte des XVI. und des XVII. Jahrhunderts (Göttingen, 1877). By the